

***Remarks***

Applicants again thank the Examiner for his careful consideration of this application. Reconsideration of this application is now respectfully requested in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

Claims 1-14 and 25-39 are now pending in the application, with Claims 1, 25, 34, and 37 being the independent claims. Claim 1 has been amended, and new Claims 34-39 have been added. The new claims find their support in the claims as originally filed; in particular, Claim 34 was formed by combining original Claim 1 with original Claim 14, and Claim 37 was formed by combining original Claim 1 with original Claim 6.

Applicants note that, in the Amendment and Reply submitted on December 8, 2004, they inadvertently mislabeled Claims 2-14 as being "previously presented" when they were actually "original" (although it is also true that "original" claims have always been "previously presented"). This has been corrected in the listing of claims in this paper.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 4, 6, 7, and 9-14 at Page 4 of the Office Action, as well as the allowability of Claims 25-33. Applicants have opted not to amend Claims 4, 6, 7, and 9-14 at this time to include the limitations of the claims from which they depend.

At Pages 2-3, the Office Action rejects Claims 1-3 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kanazawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,920,089). At Page 3, the Office Action

rejects Claims 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hsu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,818,085). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the following reasons.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "a resistance region disposed in the layer between the first transistor and the body contact region to substantially *electrically* isolate the first transistor from the body contact region, the resistance region having a resistivity higher than a resistivity of the layer." Applicants respectfully submit that the insertion of the word, "electrically," is supported by the use of the various forms of the word "isolate" throughout Applicants' specification, particularly in paragraphs 6-12.

In contrast, Kanazawa et al., noting Fig. 5B, col. 8, lines 55-65, and col. 9, lines 41-55, for example, discloses a common high-voltage power supply ( $V_{DDH}$ ) being coupled to the bodies of all regions. Hsu et al., noting, for example, col. 3, lines 44-46, discloses a single body contact formed to provide a common body contact for all transistors (i.e., all regions). Therefore, neither Kanazawa et al. nor Hsu et al. discloses a device in which a resistance region provides substantial *electrical* isolation between a first transistor and a body contact region, as claimed in Claim 1, as amended.

In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 and Claims 2-14, which depend from Claim 1, are allowable over the cited prior art, for at least these reasons.

As discussed above, new Claims 34-39 have been added, where Claims 34 and 37 are independent claims. Claim 34 was formed by combining original Claim 1 with original Claim 14, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Similarly, Claim 37 was formed by combining original Claim 1 with original Claim 6, also indicated as containing allowable

Applicants: RIPPKE et al.  
Appl. No. 10/727,552

subject matter. Given the allowable subject matter, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 34 and 37, as well as their respective dependent claims (Claims 35 and 36 and Claims 38 and 39, respectively) are allowable over the cited prior art.


### ***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/28/05

  
Jeffrey W. Gluck, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 44,457  
VENABLE LLP  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998  
Telephone: (202) 344-4000  
Direct Dial: (202) 344-8017  
Telefax: (202) 344-8300